

elects Species I, on which Claims 1-5 and 8-10 read, drawn to a wire core.

Applicant does not traverse the Restriction.

Applicant continues to assert allowability of Species II, on which Claims 6-7 read, drawn to a process of making a wire core, for purposes of further prosecution in a divisional, continuation, continuation-in-part Application or otherwise.

No change in the inventorship is believed to be necessary or desirable as a result of the Election.

REMARKS

Comments of Examiner MAYO have been reviewed carefully along with pertinent sections of the Patent Act, Patent Rules, Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, legal treatises and relevant decisional law. The Examiner held in the Restriction that the Application contains claims directed to patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

1. Species I, Claims 1-5 and 8-10 drawn to a wire core.
2. Species II, Claims 6-7 drawn to a process of making a wire core.

In compliance with 35 USC 1.21 Applicant elects the single Species I for prosecution on the merits in the present Application. Claims 1-5 and 8-10 read on Species I to which claims of the Application shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

Applicant does not traverse the Restriction. However, Applicant does continue to assert allowability of Species II, Claims 6-7, drawn to a process of making a wire core, for possible further prosecution in a divisional, continuation, continuation-in-part application or otherwise.


No change to the inventorship appears to be necessary or desirable by virtue of the Election.

Upon allowance of a generic claim, Applicants reserve their rights to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the Election, Applicants will indicate which are readable upon the elected species as called for in MPEP § 809.02(a).

It is believed that foregoing ELECTION and Remarks respond fully and fairly to the Restriction. If anything further is required, it is requested respectfully that the Examiner telephone Applicant's United States Patent Attorney at the number set forth below herein.

Courtesy, cooperation and skill of Primary Examiner William H. MAYO, III are acknowledged and appreciated.

Respectfully,



CHARLES E. BAXLEY

Attorney of Record

USPTO Reg 20,149

90 John Street, Third Floor

New York, NY 10038

Tel: (212) 791-7200

Fax: (212) 791-7276

E-Mail:ceb@hartbaxley.com

CEB:lp/13936B